

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/118,833	07/20/1998	TOSHIRO NISHI	0965-0232P-S	9403
2292	7590 05/03/2004		EXAMINER	
BIRCH ST	EWART KOLASCH &	CREPEAU, JONATHAN		
PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
TALLSCIT	BRC11, VA 220-10-07-1		1746	
		DATE MAILED: 05/03/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

(min)	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/118,833	NISHI ET AL.			
•	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Jonathan S. Crepeau	1746			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 26 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applicable in the sapplication of this application is a simely filed amendment white all (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	cation. A proper reply to a chiplaces the application in			
	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The danave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 7 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three movement patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in			
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>15 April 2004</u>. App 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF</li> </ol>					
<ol><li>The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b</li></ol>	ecause:				
(a) \( \square\) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by ma	erially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejections.	ction(s): 112 first paragraph reje	ction of claim 29.			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: 4-30					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).				
10. Other:		J. Cy			
		ેંગેnathan Crepeau Patent Examiner Art Unit: 1746			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants reiterate their belief that the claims are distinguished over Soma and JP '913, however, the claims are still not believed to be distinguished over these references for the reasons already set forth on the record.